

the wealthy pay their fair share of taxes.

When we talk about resolutions condemning something—I am not, again, sure why we are condemning a particular theory—we might be today thinking about condemning the actions of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives today. They got rid of a Member of their leadership for the crime of suggesting that that party should not maintain a big lie implying that Donald Trump won the election. Shall we condemn that? I think that is worth condemning.

I think we might want to condemn the fact that we have more income and wealth inequality today in America than at any time since the 1920s. Let's condemn that. Maybe we want to condemn the fact that every scientist who has studied the issue tells us that climate change is a threat to our Nation and the world, and we have done virtually nothing to lead the world in addressing climate change. Let's condemn that inaction.

Let's condemn the fact that in the richest country in the history of the world, we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth. How about condemning that?

Let's condemn the fact, maybe, that half of our people are living paycheck to paycheck. Let's condemn the fact that we live in a country which has institutional racism.

We can go on and on. There are a lot of things to condemn, but I don't know that it is in the best interest of the U.S. Senate to be condemning a particular economic theory.

You don't like it, argue against it. That is fine. But I don't know that we have to spend our time condemning it.

So with that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. So I don't disagree with what Senator SANDERS said in terms of policy that needs to be debated, but a classic tactic when you are focusing on how you are going to pay for something is to change the subject. And whatever you think about what happened over in the House of Representatives, whatever you think about the other issues, this is about being honest with future generations and where has that worked and been a good end result.

When it comes to some of the taxation part of it, that is a smokescreen because even if you raise all the revenue they are talking about with those taxes—and I am a believer that corporations should pay their fair share. Multinationals that flatten their tax rate, that is different from many C corps, many corporations. But the dishonesty in that argument is that you couldn't cover even 20 percent of our existing structural deficit. So you need to be honest.

If you want to do this, ask your kids, ask your grandkids if they are willing to put that burden on them. And there is no theory out there, other than this which is being used as a current rationalization, that would make that ever have a pleasant outcome.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, if I could respond?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I am not sure—the Senator from Indiana suggested a moment ago that the President was not interested in raising taxes, and, of course, he has a very specific proposal to raise taxes.

And I would suggest to my colleague from Indiana that if we want to talk about the burden on our kids and on our grandchildren as a result of the national debt, maybe we should also be discussing the fact that, under the last administration, a massive tax break was given to the very wealthiest people in this country and the largest corporations. We were told that that tax plan would pay for itself, but, in fact, it will result in almost \$2 trillion in additional national debt, and virtually all of those benefits went to the people on top.

So all that I am saying is, we can argue taxation; we can argue economic policy; we can argue why we are the only major country on Earth not to guarantee healthcare to all people; we can argue why we are paying, by far, the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs; we can argue why we have a political system that allows billionaires to buy elections—a lot of things that we could be talking about, but I am not sure that it is in the best interest of the Senate to be condemning a particular economic idea that some economists have brought up.

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. I know we have a vote coming up, and I won't belabor it.

I think the basis for maybe a good conversation, because we are not going to solve it today, is when it comes to the tax package that was put through in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017—and I would have some authority on this, Senator SANDERS. I spent 37 years in the trenches running a small business that ended up being a larger company. Three of my kids run it with a good young executive team—the American dream. And my observation was that we had kind of hit the sweet spot.

And the CBO, which actually put that original cost of \$1.5 trillion—\$150 billion per year, over 10 years—said that we were actually generating record revenues pre-COVID and that they could have revised, and still might, that trajectory.

I think if we are going to go forward, you have to realize that there is a limit to anything you can do through government. And when you try to raise taxes, you have to be honest about it. Over 50 years, regardless of what the

tax rate has been, the economy has generated about 17 percent of our GDP with tax revenues because when they are high, there is less economic activity. You actually find a sweet spot, like we did with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, and the economy was proving it pre-COVID.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### VOTE ON STROMAN NOMINATION

Mr. SANDERS. I know of no further debate on the Stroman nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Stroman nomination?

Mr. SANDERS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Ex.]

#### YEAS—66

Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Bennet	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	Kelly	Schumer
Capito	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Cassidy	Markey	Sullivan
Collins	Menendez	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Thune
Cortez Masto	Moran	Toomey
Cramer	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warnock
Ernst	Ossoff	Warren
Feinstein	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Graham	Portman	Young

#### NAYS—32

Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Sasse
Burr	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Daines	Marshall	Wicker
Fischer	McConnell	

#### NOT VOTING—2

Heinrich Leahy

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the